

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

SPECIAL MEETING

May 28, 2020

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairperson Diana Atvars

Board members: Craig Krueger, Henry Liu, Stephanie Monk and Shaffer White

EXCUSED ABSENCES: Kevin Sutton

STAFF PRESENT: David Lee and Scott Reynolds, Redmond Planning

MEETING MINUTES: Carolyn Garza, LLC

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting, and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

Projects up for Approval have 10 minutes for a presentation, and Pre-Applications have 15 minutes for a presentation.

CALL TO ORDER

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order by Ms. Atvars at 7:00 p.m.

PRE-APPLICATION

LAND-2019-00360 Redmond Square Buildings A & B

Neighborhood: Downtown

Description: Mixed-use development with approximately 580 residential units

Location: 16563 Redmond Way and 16425 Cleveland Street

Applicant: Mark McKallor and Jay Liu with MGRM, Inc.

Prior Review Dates: 07/05/18, 08/01/19 and 02/20/20

Staff Contact: Scott Reynolds, 425-556-2409 or sreynolds@redmond.gov

Mr. Scott Reynolds stated that the project had been reviewed previously under PREP but was now under Formal review and a new project number. Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) request are directly tied to five areas of staff concern as stated in the staff report.

Ms. Atvars asked for clarification that the staff opinion is that the project is not ready for Approval, and Mr. Reynolds replied that staff believes that additional work is needed in order to achieve code compliance on the project.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD

Mr. White:

- Stated being a fan of the Tiscareno Triangle building in Redmond.
- Mr. White stated agreeing with many comments in the staff report and that the response to previous concerns appears minimal.
- Mr. White asked to know if there are restrictions and constraints that will stop concerns from being addressed.
- Mr. White stated that the project is extremely important to Redmond in size and location.
- Mr. White stated that images were inspirational.
- Mr. White stated that on Building A, scrim feels tacked on and other ways could be explored to create more interest.
- Mr. White stated that the inset glass at a corner is a step in the right direction and could be extended.
- Mr. White stated that materiality and color of the volume should change for more flash.
- Mr. White asked if fiber cement on two elevations changed to metal panel.

Mr. Bob Tiscareno *with* Tiscareno Associates replied yes, cladding turns the corner and switches to a different material. Not seen in the image is a new sloped roof previously requested by the Board.

Mr. David Lee asked that page numbers be identified for those calling in and not with a computer screen. Mr. White replied page 5 of part 3.

- Mr. White stated that notes could be forwarded to the applicant team for further review after the presentation.
- Mr. White stated liking the sloped roof and that angularity will help the project.
- Mr. White stated that lofted volumes at top could go further.
- Mr. White stated being drawn to the idea of columns telegraphing up to the loft mass to reinforce the scrim.
- Mr. White stated premium materials such as brick or concrete should be used.
- Mr. White stated that a canopy that currently feels underwhelming should be bumped out further in all elevations where the element occurs.

- Mr. White stated that balconies had been removed and should come back to break up massing.
- Mr. White suggested lining up columns and recessing glazing back.

Mr. Scott Glazebrook *with* Tiscareno Associates stated that a previous Board comment regarding loft spaces was to be more unified along the top and remove recesses and asked if the previous direction had changed.

- Mr. White replied that there may have been a disconnect in reaction to the comment and that the balcony condition could be uniform across the top was what was intended to be referred to.
- Mr. White stated that questions, disagreement or conditions that would prevent the suggestions from being realized would be appreciated.
- Mr. White stated that regarding the scrim condition in general, windows could be recessed further back from the scrim in order to feel a part of the mass behind, if architecturally possible.
- Mr. White stated that the southeast corner is a positive and powerful mass.
- Mr. White stated that execution of finishes and details are what require further refinement.
- Mr. White stated that column angularity activates the corner and applauded the move.

Mr. Lee reminded the Board to narrate the page of the slide being commented on. Mr. White replied page 7 of part 3.

- Mr. White stated that previous comments regarding the scrim and loft elements apply to the next slide shown.
- Mr. White stated that some portions swim in beige color and modulating masses could have different finish materials.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that fiber cement panel and color fiber cement, a different product with additional depth and texture, would be used. There is subtle differentiation between two volumes.

- Mr. White stated being okay with the materials if there is confidence. and that the difference should be evident in response to comments.

Mr. Tiscareno replied that rendering true material colors is a challenge and that the material board could be displayed through the computer camera.

- Mr. White stated that photographs of completed buildings with the materials would be helpful as well as a material board with the different textures side by side.

- Mr. White stated agreeing with staff that the corner volume is not successful yet; brick material could go all the way to the top. Mixed brick may be too busy. One darker brick color to distinguish the corner volume from elsewhere could work.
- Mr. White stated scrim material could be more developed but if the team is confident in the current scrim condition, reasons should be brought along with large detail to the next presentation.

Mr. Glazebrook stated, regarding the brow of the roof, that how far the roof can extend is constrained due to a recent easement change along the street, but a deviation could be requested.

- Mr. White stated that the Board is generally in favor of variances if design is furthered.

Mr. Reynolds replied that this is a technical matter between Public Works and Planning on how structures interact with easements and right-of ways. Staff can take DRB recommendation for conversation, but technical matters of an easement will prevail.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked what kind of easement is in question.

Mr. Reynolds replied utility, as example, streetlights, fire hydrants and dry utilities.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the easement concern extended to roofline features.

Mr. Reynold replied yes, in example, cranes used for replacing streetlights cannot be hindered by the building.

Mr. Alexis Chartouni *with* Legacy Partners stated previous design included an overhang, but that the Technical Committee had specifically required the applicant to pull the building overhang back.

Mr. White:

- Stated that because of the height of the element, impact at street level or of streetlights would be remote and the height could be reiterated to the Technical Committee; the issue should be revisited.

Mr. Glazebrook stated that the revised direction from Technical staff only applies to building elements and not canopies. Attached canopies do extend out further than the code allows.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the comments regarding the roofline could be taken to the Technical review with the result reported at the next presentation.

- Mr. White replied this would be appreciated.
- Mr. White moved to page 9, the northwest corner; comments regarding large massing would be the same as were given for previous renderings.
- Mr. White appreciated brick up an additional floor.
- Mr. White stated being okay with some corners not competing for attention.
- Mr. White asked why a parapet extends along an elevation rather than mirroring the parapet on the other side.

Mr. Glazebrook stated that layering is another aspect of the overall design concept.

- Mr. White stated that the Board in general was concerned regarding massing and the impression of smaller volumes would be helpful but asked other Board members to give comments.

Mr. Reynolds stated that under code or design standards, the corner is considered mid-block for future re-development and not a main corner.

- Mr. White stated still being comfortable with the corner volume.
- Mr. White continued to page 10 of part 3, northeast corner, and stated the corner is still underwhelming; the corner is an entry point for the woonerf.
- Mr. White stated that on page 11 there was not much change from the previous iteration.
- Mr. White stated that there is a mid-point opportunity for brick extended up, artwork or signage to brand the space.
- Mr. White asked how the space will remain activated at night if residential units have blinds closed, and if live-work units would be considered.

Ms. Abigail Pearl DeWeese *with* Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson asked for a discussion regarding landscaping at the pedestrian level and stated that the rendering may not accurately portray the intention. A change from the prior proposal is that units are now designed to accommodate live work.

Mr. Tiscareno asked if fly-through animation had been viewed by the Board and that additional landscape had been added.

An unidentified speaker stated that the woonerf landscape design is shown on page 12 of 18, 1.11.

- Mr. White was supportive of the landscaping. Activity along the building edge helps to liven the space. Live work conditions are a step in the right direction.

Mr. Glazebrook stated that the units are designed to be able to be converted to live work or small commercial space units but are now primarily residential units only. The north facades of both buildings of the woonerf have commercial food and beverage as well as other active community activities elsewhere such as a fitness center and a bike lounge. The rendering shows a small middle portion. Lighting is designed to create a vibrant and active nighttime experience and a safe, inviting pass-through. The pedestrian public space has been designed larger than code requires.

Ms. Kim Demarst *with* Tiscareno Associations stated that the amount of activity is layered vertically. The courtyard overlooks are well lit with amenity lighting.

- Mr. White stated there were no further objections to the woonerf and applauded the team for those spaces.
- Mr. White repeated that the blank wall materiality or placemaking opportunity should be examined.
- Mr. White moved to the southern elevation of Building A, page 13 of part 3 and stated appreciation for the roof angle
- Mr. White stated that angularity would play well for both buildings.
- Mr. White stated that the west elevation of Building A, page 14, was a challenge due to the building not having a backside for behind the scenes functions, but Building B is more successful.
- Mr. White stated that the ground floor of the west elevation feels massive and design elements could be used to add rhythm and vertical connection; the ground floor does not relate to the floors above.
- Mr. White stated that the building needs to feel less massive and the scale of elevations needs to be broken down.

Mr. Tiscareno stated that there is a row of existing trees in building-sidewalk-tree planters that will screen the service side.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the trees will be counted as impacted and should not be relied upon for the future.

- Mr. White stated that the sidewalk between the trees and building should be composed for the pedestrian perspective, possibly with another materiality, and asked about a vegetative wall in a previous presentation.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that utilities and equipment are located at the wall and a safe location from a pedestrian pathway.

- Mr. White suggested dividing the one massive louvre for rhythm, anything for more compositional sense.

Ms. Demarst stated that there is depth and play in volumes at the bottom not expressed in the rendering. The vehicle access only goes to the first garage door and the rest is service access, no pedestrian path.

- Mr. White stated that the rendering does read very flat, and an expression at the next presentation would be appreciated.
- Mr. White stated that on page 15, there are opportunities for vertical modulation.
- Mr. White stated that the east elevation on page 16 could have more metal panel to break down masses.
- Mr. White stated that on page 17, there is an opportunity to add interest with two or three different kinds of balconies, adding to the composition of the elevations. Playing with the composition and not repeating the same execution in each bay would be encouraged.
- Mr. White asked if, on page 18, the floating volume was a rendering issue.

Mr. Glazebrook replied the rendering shows courtyard elevations and the extension of volume. The Cleveland Street side projects further and metal panel is carried into the first parts of the courtyard.

Ms. Demarst stated that the image can be seen on page 2.10 or page 12 of 23 in part 3.

- Mr. White stated that a previous comment had been that the top of the interior elevation uses the same horizontal datum and may not be effective; opportunities for vertical modulation should be explored.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that angled parapets are on projected portions of the façade and stated that the portion of volume could be elevated, with a flat parapet.

- Mr. White stated being in support of the idea of Mr. Glazebrook, a level of modulation that would be helpful.

Mr. Liu:

- Mr. Liu stated feeling okay with Building A overall.
- Mr. Liu stated that the Building B cover sheet does not represent the excitement and that there should be one more round of fine-tuning work, going back to inspirational photos with prism for uniqueness.

Ms. Atvars stated that Building B would be visited after Building A.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated appreciating the comments of Mr. White.
- Ms. Monk stated agreeing with the staff memo that there are gaps in the latest updates and not all concerns and suggestions from the previous review have been addressed.
- Ms. Monk stated that given the extent of changes required and conditions necessary for an Approval at this meeting, the project should be brought back for another presentation.
- Ms. Monk stated that Building A appeared better than Building B.
- Ms. Monk stated that the southeast corner of Building A appears to be a wall of beige; the two-story window is good but should come down further to add interest.
- Ms. Monk stated that a design at the corner should pull people into the woonerf on part 3 of 4, page 5 of 23.

Mr. Glazebrook asked for page 2.04 to be displayed.

- Ms. Monk stated that a rendering of the view from either side of the block that would be seen by pedestrians to be aware of the woonerf would be helpful.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that a widened sidewalk area had been created to allow for greater landscape projection into the public realm while still adhering to fire department requirements.

- Ms. Monk stated that on page 6 of part 3, the material is more interesting than the rendering shows on the previous page.

Mr. Glazebrook asked Ms. Monk if, regarding the corner, bringing down to the story would bring the project closer to approval.

- Ms. Monk replied yes.

Mr. Glazebrook stated that the design team liked the asymmetry of not bringing all the way down, but if dynamism of the asymmetry can be maintained the corner can be changed.

- Ms. Monk stated that a couple of options could be brought to the next presentation.

Mr. White:

- Stated being supportive of bringing down an additional level.
- Mr. White stated that if materiality stays the same a different color should be considered, contrasting the rest as an important corner.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that improvements had been made to the woonerf in response to a prior comment.
- Ms. Monk stated appreciation of the addition of extra windows on page 11 in part 3 but that there is still an empty space; brick could be brought up higher in example.
- Ms. Monk stated that the services side of the building, page 14 in part 3, feels massive and the vegetative wall would be more interesting and approachable even though not a main pedestrian thoroughfare.
- Ms. Monk stated that existing trees should not be depended on.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that less developed and less flashy renderings will be brought back.

Mr. Krueger:

- Agrees with the issues in the staff report and the comments of Mr. White.
- Mr. Krueger suggested reviewing the Minutes from the last presentation.
- Mr. Krueger agreed with celebrating corners.
- Mr. Krueger stated liking the idea of pulling back the top floor.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the same colors and materials do not change on any side of the building and suggested introducing variety at corners.
- Mr. Krueger stated that a gasket at the breezeway could add variety.
- Mr. Krueger stated that variety in windows would be desirable.
- Mr. Krueger stated that looking back at inspirational photos would be key.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that expanding the new window pop would be positive.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the northeast corner was good, but masses should be purposeful and a rendering perspective driving on Redmond Way from the west would help understanding.
- Ms. Atvars complimented landscaping, coordinating to the Light Rail Station.
- Ms. Atvars asked if there is a public art component.

Mr. Glazebrook replied no.

- Ms. Atvars suggested that the flat wall on page 11 of 23 in the part 3 packet could be an opportunity for art.
- Ms. Atvars stated that on Building B, page 10 in part 4, the northeast corner has greatly improved.
- Ms. Atvars stated that on Building B, masses are interesting, but materiality change is needed; the side that faces the Light Rail Station needs to shine.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that the rendering does not reflect the different materials and patterns, and how light will read. The long façade is broken with form rather than colors that would be busy.

Mr. Tiscareno displayed and described the material board, and for people on the virtual meeting without access to a screen referenced page 2.11 for building A and 3.12 for Building B.

Mr. White:

- Stated that photos of the board in daylight, standing vertically, would help at the next presentation.

Mr. Monk:

- Agreed with Mr. White.

Mr. Liu:

- Had no comments regarding the material board.
- Mr. Liu stated that colors should be fine and being more concerned about massing.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that the side facing Light Rail should be inviting and intriguing. Color could enhance.

Ms. Atvars:

- Asked if two medium gray masses in the middle of a cover sheet view are different on either side of the plane.

Mr. Glazebrook replied yes and described detail.

- Ms. Atvars asked if the colors were different as well and not only the texture.

Mr. Glazebrook replied yes and described detail.

- Ms. Atvars asked that renderings at the next presentation reflect material contrast more realistically.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated that in the first inspirational image the takeaway is the joyful placement of windows.
- Mr. Liu stated that the second image takeaway is application of accent wood texture.
- Mr. Liu stated that the third image takeaway was the punctuation of the boxed balcony and color contrast.
- Mr. Liu stated that none of these takeaways are present on building B.
- Mr. Liu stated that all windows and balconies are very conventional, and more playfulness could occur on the Building B façade.
- Mr. Liu stated believing that the Design Review Board role is to stay away from specific design elements and rather to comment on general building direction; if a general direction is absorbed, the design team can be successful as long as the client is on board.

Mr. Glazebrook explained how different aspects of the inspirational images had been taken and modified to fit with the overall building aesthetic.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the comment of Mr. Liu is that the inspirational images are not seen applied to the building and specific applications should be brought to the next presentation.
- Ms. Atvars stated agreeing with Mr. Liu that general direction is being given and the design team is trusted. The Design Review Board does not design the buildings but can be asked for guidance during the process.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated not having as many comments for Building B as for Building A.
- Ms. Monk mentioned a rendering mistake of a missing balcony middle right.
- Ms. Monk stated appreciating the material board and that high-quality photos of the materials in daylight would be helpful, but also with various light changes with

the understanding that there more months of gray and rain in the location than sun.

- Ms. Monk stated that Building B will be seen from the light rail stop, a first impression of Redmond, and will be important to be impressive.
- Ms. Monk stated being interested in different ideas to change roof massing at the front.
- Ms. Monk stated that page 6 of the part 4 PDF looks very good, and the canopy helps a lot. Black and white windows work well together.
- Ms. Monk stated that page 7, the southwest corner, looks good with contrast materials.
- Ms. Monk stated that there had been a staff memo question regarding premium materials used on balconies, page 11, and suggested that a wood material on the underside of balconies, the roof over the balcony below, would be good.
- Ms. Monk stated that overall Building B is looking good.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that on Building B not liking the design of the northeast corner but going along with the Board.

Mr. Glazebrook asked Mr. Krueger for clarification regarding color changes desired in comments for clarity.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that Building B is the same as Building A with the same color palette, but still more color in Building A than Building B; there could be ways to add variety to the exterior.
- Mr. Krueger stated that the east elevation of Building B will be high profile.
- Mr. Krueger stated that renderings possibly do not show the detail.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that Redmond code recommends the use of muted and earth tone colors with occasional accent colors with special approval and asked if accent color would make Approval more likely for the project.

Mr. Krueger:

- Replied yes, and that code also states that variety to a building is through material, services, shapes and colors, encouraged by the code.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated agreeing with Mr. Krueger regarding accent color but suggesting leaving color choices up to the applicant.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated supporting the accent color being chosen by the applicant and that the option may help address issues on the other side with the similar gray colors.

Mr. White:

- Stated differentiation of finishes was important and would like to know that the design is rendering correctly.
- Mr. White was open to seeing what could be done with an accent color.

Mr. Krueger:

- Stated that color variety would not need to be a huge change but possibly only siding, color, materiality and windows just to break up the exterior.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the detail has come over to Building B from Building A.
- Mr. White stated that many volumes have standard fiber cement panel, and some is okay, but if everywhere this is where the reaction comes from.

Mr. Krueger:

- Mr. Krueger stated agreeing with Mr. White.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the team are the designers and are trusted and suggestions are only meant to inspire and are not necessarily specific requests.
- Mr. White stated that the Buildings have been brought far in design and stated appreciating the challenges.
- Mr. White stated that the team should push back if suggestions are not compatible.
- Mr. White stated that the inspirational images are excellent.
- Mr. White stated that on page 5 of part 4, inseting the balconies clarify the southeast corner but there is more that could be done; the first impression from the light rail station.
- Mr. White understood the desire to unify the building but doing the same thing at multiple corners undercuts the design element.

- Mr. White stated having concerns regarding the general elevation, feeling massive even with a difference in materiality.
- Mr. White asked if there would be an opportunity to use different balconies at gaskets to reinforce a break between masses.
- Mr. White suggested bringing different options to the next presentation.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that there are two stacks of balconies close together with no separation for privacy.

Mr. Glazebrook replied that there is a slight plane change.

- Ms. Monk asked how much plane change there is.

Mr. Glazebrook replied two or four feet.

Mr. Liu:

- Stated agreeing with Ms. Monk regarding privacy, an opportunity for a boxed or half-boxed balcony.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the east elevation on page 4 is successful.
- Mr. White stated being receptive to any opportunities to celebrate a kink or angle in a corner.

Ms. Demarst asked for clarification that the modulation feels meaningful and not punched as much as other elevations, and that if the same regular rhythm were wrapped around the entire building, would the design lose novelty or if this works now because the design stands out.

Mr. White:

- Replied a little bit of both.
- Mr. White stated that there are opportunities to introduce a double-up once or twice on elevations for separation of masses.

Ms. Demarst asked if the rhythm is the aspect to channel.

- Mr. White replied that the rhythm is lacking in other elevations.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the southwest corner on page 7 is the most successful for Building B, singing compositionally, but feels like the southeast corner.
- Mr. White stated that the northwest corner on page 9 is effective and has vertical modulation but every mass is the same top to bottom.
- Mr. White stated that there is one elevation with an exterior beige bay and there may be an opportunity on other elevations to break up grey.
- Mr. White liked the color palette on this elevation better than others.
- Mr. White stated not liking the chamfer on the northeast corner on page 10, underwhelming.
- Mr. White stated that the east elevation on page 12 is successful with clear modulation and from a service standpoint.
- Mr. White stated that the southern elevation on page 13 has a long stretch at top that feels heavy.
- Mr. White stated appreciating tying the breezeway to the bay, but that materiality of the balconies could be darker to create a break.
- Mr. White asked if panels are spandrel glass.

Mr. Glazebrook replied louvres for anticipated mechanical needs for the retail space, attempting to provide the greatest flexibility possible and appeal to a wide array of potential tenants.

- Mr. White asked for enlarged views of the southern ground plane.
- Mr. White continued to page 14, north elevation, and stated that there is consistent horizontal datum that works against the design but because of the shorter distance it may be okay, brick coming up helps.
- Mr. White stated that on page 15, west elevation, the design is looser and hoped for more spirit on exterior elevations.
- Mr. White hoped for interest to be added to the space such as balconies and the color palette.

Mr. Tiscareno stated that less is more powerful and asked how much more could successfully be added to the building. Mr. Tiscareno agreed with Mr. White that the area in the woonerf is more playful and on the streets more refined and that this was intentional.

Mr. White:

- Stated that the northern elevation is successful.
- Mr. White was on board for the eastern elevation.

- Mr. White stated that the southern elevation is where most concern appears to be for materiality and mass.
- Mr. White stated that on other projects applicants have been encouraged to bring undeveloped ideas to the Board between presentations for guidance.
- Mr. White stated that refinement and not necessarily adding elements were the suggestions.

Ms. DeWeese asked Mr. Reynolds if there is a mechanism to forward concept designs. Mr. Reynolds replied that another meeting could be set. Mr. David Lee replied that at this time of pandemic, policy has been adjusted and that ideas could be bounced off the Board without an entire materials review. Ms. DeWeese asked how the meeting would occur and Mr. Lee replied not virtually but a consensus building yay or nay vote coordinated through Mr. Reynolds.

Mr. White:

- Stated having an extreme interest in how the project is executed but comments should be interpreted as the opinion of one of six Board Members.

Ms. Monk:

- Stated that simple trends and themes should be examined as well as literal items from the staff memo, and if the applicant disagrees an explanation can be presented.

Mr. Krueger and Mr. Liu stated that there were no further comments.

Ms. Atvars:

- Thanked the team for working with the Board for such a long virtual meeting, and that the Board does not normally dissect projects to this degree but that the team might take away that the design is strong and that the Board cares that design will be as good as possible; if the project were in a different location there may have already been Approval.
- Ms. Atvars acknowledged that the team had hoped for Approval at this meeting.
- Ms. Atvars stated that for the next presentation, the format should be regarding why the team feels the project is ready for Approval.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the notes of Mr. White can be forwarded to the team if needed.

Mr. Glazebrook asked about Administrative Design Flexibility requests, which have been reduced from the previous submittal, and additional deviation requests. Mr.

Glazebrook asked for clarification that the Board had been in support of the southeast large corner with detailing.

Ms. Atvars:

- Replied yes, and the proportions in size or shape changes; the overall feeling is that the southeast corner is headed in the right direction.
- Ms. Atvars stated that the Board is generally in support of the kind of flexibility requested and at Final Approval more comments will be specific. Arguments for the flexibilities are helpful.

Mr. Glazebrook asked for clarification regarding a request for reduction in two of the private patio sizes.

Ms. Atvars:

- Stated that the Board had no objections.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the applicant can submit requests for clarification and comments to the Board to be routed through Mr. David Lee, and that staff takeaway is that there is the possibility of Design Review Board support at the next presentation.

Ms. Atvars asked if there were any further questions or comments and there were none.

Ms. Demarst thanked all Board members and thanked everyone for stating page numbers during Board Comments. The virtual meeting feels more collaborative and more of a conversation rather than confrontation.

Ms. Atvars stated that the video presentation was very professional and organized and believed that virtual meetings may have benefits over in-person meetings.

Mr. David Lee asked if an entire meeting should be reserved for this project for the next presentation. Ms. Atvars replied yes. Mr. White stated that many requested changes had been small, and Mr. Krueger agreed.

ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION BY MR. WHITE TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:46 P.M. MOTION
SECONDED BY MR. KRUEGER. MOTION APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY.**

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY